



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Take also the measure of greatness which Christ presents—one that we all recognize to be true—and yet how slowly it has made progress. It is the most revolutionary of doctrines that greatness is to be measured by service. The selfish idea is that greatness is to be measured by what you can compel people to do for you; but the real measure of greatness is what you voluntarily do for others. Life is not to be estimated by what you get out of it; it is to be estimated by what you put into it. Now, this needs no proof. It is a self-evident truth, and yet how slowly this doctrine makes progress throughout the world.

You are engaged in the promotion of a great cause, and because it is great it does not move rapidly. The trees that stand the blasts of the storm are the trees of slow growth. Those trees that spring up quickly have not great strength. It is because your cause takes hold upon that which is most vital in life and of that which is most fundamental in civilization that you must not expect it to run—you must be content that it walks. But it is growing, and we could not face the future with hope if it were not growing. If we could be convinced that the idea of peace was going backward, there would not be a single star in the sky. It is only because we do believe, and believe with all our hearts, that the peace movement is making progress; for that reason, and for that reason only, we believe that the future is bright. We must not expect that the progress will be the same everywhere throughout the world. We have to meet conditions, some of them far from ideal. The ideal inspires, and we look to it and work toward it. We must not be disappointed if we find it impossible at once to realize the ideal. It would not be a high ideal if it were within our reach; it would not be a worthy ideal if it were not lofty enough to keep us looking upward all the time; it would not be an ideal worth while if we ever expected fully to attain it.

But our cause is making progress. There is not a country in the world that has not felt to some extent the impetus of the peace movement; if you have any doubt of it, let me give you evidence that I regard as conclusive and most encouraging. Your chairman has been kind enough to refer to the peace plan which has, by the President's authority, been presented to the world. It was, on the 26th day of April—a little more than a year ago—presented to the foreign representatives residing in Washington. Before a year had expired the principle had been accepted by more than thirty governments representing more than three-fourths of all the people of the world. Now, when the governments representing more than three-fourths of all the human beings on this globe will endorse a plan that contemplates a period of deliberation and investigation before there can be a declaration of war or the commencement of hostilities; when that can be done by governments representing more than three-fourths of the people of the world, and done in a single year, certainly there is no reason for discouragement. Not only has this been done, but treaties have been signed with fifteen of these countries, and ten more have their treaties practically ready. Among the ten whose treaties are practically completed are Great Britain, France, and China, and the three greatest republics of South America. When the ten now approaching completion are signed, as they will be at no distant day, we will have considerably more than

one-half of the people of the world living under governments which are linked to us by treaties which provide that neither side shall fire a shot until the cause of dispute has been investigated by an impartial commission.

That is the progress that has been made in a little more than a year, and yet this progress would not have been possible had it not been for the preliminary work done in the years that have passed. I rejoice in the prospect today and in the progress that we now witness; I am grateful to those who have given to this movement enthusiastic support, and who, so many years before we were born, realized that there was a higher plane than the plane of physical force upon which to settle international differences. Their labors have not been in vain. We shall not know the names of all, nor shall we be able to estimate with accuracy the contribution that each has made. But what difference does that make? What if the world does not know? He who from a worthy motive strives for a noble cause is not concerned whether others know what he does or speak words of praise; it is sufficient for him that he has done his part and lived up to the opportunities that have come to him.

It takes the work of all to accomplish the total result. A few years ago my wife and I visited the Grand Canyon in Arizona. We went down 4,600 feet from the top of the Canyon to where the Colorado River wends its way, and there we saw evidences of the action of the waters through the ages. As we looked upon that stream, I wondered how many drops of water had found their way through that Canyon. No arithmetic would enable us to compute them; neither could we tell just what influence each one had had—it was the work of all. And so with every great movement—it is the work not of one, or of a few, but of the multitude. I am glad to be with those who, as a part of the multitude, are working for peace.

Object Lessons in the Mexican Crisis.

By Hon. Richard Bartholdt.

Mr. President, Ladies, and Gentlemen:

If I had not prepared an address this evening, I should have much preferred to speak extemporaneously on a subject which was inspired by some of the remarks of Secretary Bryan, who has just preceded me. He talked about the disappointment of those who are engaged in a movement and see sometimes the reactionary movement getting the upper hand, as it seems. I remember having read some years ago the story of an old German professor who was in that kind of a mood. He had been teaching certain theories, and to his great disappointment he learned that not only did his theories not make any headway, but they were being opposed on every hand. He felt very much disappointed about it, and one day he went out into the field, and he saw one of those great big agricultural machines. On examining it, he found that all the small wheels were turning backward, but the machine was moving forward all the same. I often think of that professor. How much he must have been gratified when he noticed that in spite of everything going backward, the movement was going forward anyhow. We should remember that, especially because of our experiences during the last few weeks.

If I were to give a name to the address I am going to deliver here tonight, I would call it "Object Lessons in the Mexican Crisis from a Peace Standpoint." Since this is not only a live, but a rather difficult, question, I am accepting responsibility not only to my conscience, but to my constituents. You must permit me to refer to my notes occasionally, so that no misrepresentation may be made.

In what I am going to say, I really do not address myself to those present so much as to the thousands and hundreds of thousands whom you all represent. Of course I do not know whether this speech will be printed. If it were a war speech, I could guarantee that it would be printed; but since it is a peace speech, I can almost guarantee that it will not be.

It seems like an anachronism to talk peace in this time of exciting war preparations. To do so will probably remind you of the old German who rushed along the street in a very great hurry. He was stopped by a friend of his and asked what was the cause of his hurry. He said, "I want to insure my house." His friend replied, "There is no need of hurry for that; you can do that some other time." The old German replied, "You talk like a fool; it is burning already."

I know that the beating of the war drum is the death knell to argument and that the appeals to what is called patriotism completely drown the voice of reason. And yet, my friends, this is a most propitious time, in my humble judgment, to test the truths and merits of the peace propaganda, because we can make the test at the hand of our immediate experience.

Oceans of ink have been spilled since the Mexican crisis has resulted in actual hostilities, yet is it not strange that the press should have utterly failed to draw the right conclusions from the situation—that the great American papers should have neglected to point the object-lessons so patent that even the thoughtless can easily grasp them? I will tell you in a minute what I mean by that.

The stock argument of the defenders of our military system is that armaments are an infallible guarantee of peace. There was a time when they were more honest—when they frankly admitted that armaments of war but incited war; but that theory has fallen in disrepute, so much so that these defenders do not dare to mention it. Since the peace movement has been growing so active they have been more diplomatic. They are now for peace, not for war. It is the insurance, they say, which we have to pay for our national security. Yet you will agree with me that today, if it were not for the remedy offered by the friends of peace, this country would be in the throes of war. Not only have our vast armaments completely failed to preserve the peace—and from a military standpoint we have never been better "prepared" to preserve it than now—but I also venture to assert that this very preparedness was and is an inducement to let loose the dogs of war. In the recent issue of a daily newspaper it was pointed out that since the Crimean war—that is, in the last fifty years—there has been an actual war practically every three years; but evidently it did not occur to the editor to conclude—and if it occurred to him, he had his reasons for not concluding—that, since the old remedy of preserving peace had utterly failed, it was now high time for a new one to be tried. And do you know that

wholly aside from the fact that great naval armaments are in themselves a temptation to put them to use, mere unforeseen accidents can play an important part in bringing on war—accidents which are solely due to the presence of battleships in foreign waters? If the "Maine," for instance, had not been in the harbor of Havana, we know there would have been no Spanish war—a war which, not counting pensions and its direct cost, has increased our naval and military expenditures by about \$175,000,000 a year. And with almost the same justification we might say that if Admiral Mayo had not been at Tampico there would have been no occasion for the President to commence hostilities against Mexico. I mention these facts not in a spirit of criticism, but only to show how utterly absurd, if not ridiculous, is the claim of our jingo friends that armaments and battleships are a guarantee of peace. Thus, in the light of the most recent events in our own history, the defenders of militarism stand convicted of preaching a fallacy. Like the man who was killed by an explosion in trying to make gold, they have been smashed by their own false theory.

Now, my friends, the preservation of the peace, I believe, has been admitted to be the highest aim of statesmanship. So well is this recognized that, as I have shown, the military system itself is being paraded as a means to that end rather than as an instrument of war. Hence the peace of the people must surely be a condition conducive to their welfare and happiness, and to be cherished by them as the most valuable asset of civilized society. If that be so, it seems proper to inquire: What have the nations of the world, what have we done to protect it and to make it secure beyond all human peradventure? Again I point to the Mexican trouble as the most illuminating answer. And what I am going to say is the second object-lesson which our recent troubles have brought home to us. A naval commander in foreign waters demands a certain kind of reparation for what he terms an insult to the American uniform and flag. In fact, without specific instructions from his Government, he issues an ultimatum to the effect that, unless his terms are complied with within a few hours, he will begin to bombard the town. The President and Congress under these forced circumstances are obliged to stand by him—of course I do not. But, in spite of the fact that Congress and the President stood by him, you can see in reality that it is not Congress which declares war, although Congress is the sole authority to declare war, according to the terms of the Constitution. It is rather a single naval officer who, acting on the spur of the moment and in an impassioned mood, dares to embroil the whole country in war. Does this not show conclusively that our peace, despite the enlightenment of the age, is not sufficiently safeguarded—that, in fact, it hangs on a very thin thread? Now it is a "*casus belli*" like this that the peace party propose to guard against. Perhaps we cannot prevent the occurrence itself—at least not as long as our battleships are moving around the world fomenting trouble—but we can guard, and ought to guard, against such trivial incidents plunging the country into the horrors of war. Gentlemen, if but the American people and all the other nations of the world would take these lessons to heart, the Mexican embroglio might eventually be hailed as a blessing in disguise!

Those of us who honestly believe in the eventual success of world organization on the basis of justice and lasting peace have had to endure many a jibe and jeer during the last few weeks. It was because for a few days the war wolf, to use a vulgar though appropriate expression, was on the outside of the peace lamb. We were ridiculed because of the inefficiency of our cure, and chided as quacks by the very men who, bewailing the failure of the cure, persistently refuse to try our medicine. In fact, we are blamed for a failure to prevent a breach of the peace which, as everybody knows, could occur only because the world is still refusing to heed our advice. But the voice of derision has suddenly been silenced. Why? Because reason has again been enthroned and the cause of peace has been vindicated by an administration which, after all, seems sincerely to be devoted to it, and as a Republican I take my hat off—figuratively speaking—when I make this statement. But now that our Government has accepted mediation, let me remind our jingo friends that the same loyalty to the flag which prompted them and us to follow the President in his warlike course, now impels us to uphold his hands when he offers the olive branch, for if it is patriotic to risk life for the country, it is no less patriotic to preserve life for the country. I ask you in all seriousness whether or not the kind of patriotism which spells preservation is not superior to the kind of patriotism which spells destruction?

So it seems, gentlemen, that in the eyes of all thinking men the Mexican crisis, by its object-lessons, is really giving impetus to the cause of peace. We have learned that battleships are no preventive of war; on the contrary, that their very existence tends rather to provoke war. We have learned also that the most priceless possession which true civilization knows—that is, the peace of society—is still the most insecure of all. We can be robbed of it by the arbitrary will of rulers, the passions of the people, so easily inflamed by mere unforeseen accidents, or by some petty officer losing his head. Let me say again that I am not criticising, but am merely illustrating what appears to be the truth.

The question is: What are you going to do about it? If I were to answer this query—and I came here for the purpose of doing so—I would say: "Turn your backs upon the dark past, with its legalized shedding of human blood, and, as the most essential requirement of progressive thought and true civilization, erect a Temple of Justice, with permanent peace as its corner-stone." This is, in a few words, the whole aim and object of the peace movement. If the people could be made to realize that in this time or day no responsible government will wantonly insult another government; if they could be made to realize that our Government, which claims to be civilized, will act honorably in all its dealings with other governments, that it must do so in this time and age, because it is watched by millions and millions of people; if they could only be made to realize that wars of conquest are out of the question, and that trade advantages can be secured by industry and enterprise much better than by force of arms, there would be no more wars, for such convictions would inevitably lead to binding international agreements which would secure our peace as well as that of other nations against all contingencies.

Let me illustrate: Suppose we had entered into a solemn contract with Mexico and all other nations of the world that in case of difference we would have an investigation first before we commenced to fight, do you believe for one moment that at the time of the investigation—that is, at the end of twelve months—anybody would care to fight about a last year's bird's nest? Hardly. This is the plan just now explained by Secretary Bryan—the plan that is now submitted to the governments for adoption. If agreed to by them, and lived up to honestly without purpose of evasion, you can readily see that such a contract would surround peace with an impregnable safeguard, and remove it from the exposed position where it is the foot-ball of politics or the plaything of rulers, or where the merest accidents and consequent popular passions could play havoc with it in the twinkling of an eye. But this would be only the beginning. Eventually peace will be fortified—to borrow a phrase from the military lexicon—by a second line of defense, consisting of solemn treaties of arbitration and a world court as a tribunal of last resort, a final arbiter of the affairs of mankind, and an impregnable bulwark of the world's peace.

How long before this new era will dawn upon us? It will not take many Mexican wars before the people will demand it. They have learned even within the last few weeks that mediation or arbitration is a much more effectual means of settling international differences than the force of arms can possibly be, for war never settles a question of right and wrong, but only which side is the strongest. And is it worth while? You might as well ask what the sun is good for. The world is now wasting three billion dollars for armaments annually, and most of this money could be saved. Lift that tremendous burden from the backs of men, and the whole human family will heave a sigh of relief. The man in the counting-room, the workman in the shop, the toiler in the field, the miner who works deep down in the bowels of the earth—all will join in benedictions, because all will be beneficiaries alike. Relieved from a crushing burden which holds the world in bondage, all conditions—physical, moral, and economical—will improve, and in leaps and bounds the people will advance to a higher level of civilization and a more glorious destiny. Ladies and gentlemen, there is not and cannot be an issue more vital and transcendent than this before the people of the earth.

Address of Hon. Walter L. Hensley.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am indeed glad to have this opportunity to address you briefly upon a subject and in behalf of a cause the importance of which to the present as well as to future generations is vastly greater than any cause in defense of which men have offered up their lives on the field of battle. Truth and humanity are upon our side. Profit, the dollar, and commercialism, with all its sordidness, is upon the other side. The issue is joined. We understand fully its meaning. We know the far-reaching consequences to the people. Therefore, the cause is worthy the best thought and the very best and most heroic effort of which we are capable.